

threat to the United States which warrants such a new hostile policy.

I have believed for some time that an expanded dialog with the Cuban Government is in the interest of the United States and Cuba. With the cold war over and little or no Soviet or Russian presence in Cuba, it simply does not make sense to completely ignore a country in our hemisphere because it is nondemocratic. Indeed, discussions and contacts on issues such as human rights, market economies, commercial relations, arms control, Caribbean affairs, the free flow of information, refugee affairs, and family visitation rights could actually help facilitate resolution of these complex problems and, I think, would do it, Mr. President, far better than nonengagement and isolation.

We have ongoing discussions with other nondemocratic countries like Saudi Arabia, Indonesia, and North Korea, and we recently opened a liaison office in Vietnam. Mr. President, we have even granted most-favored-nation status to China, so it makes little sense to outlaw virtually any contact with Cuba.

This proposal also threatens the United States effectiveness in international organizations by requiring the United States representatives to seek a United Nations embargo against Cuba and to oppose Cuban membership in international financial institutions. Mr. President, the United States has more important and pressing problems which require multilateral support and should not be required to pursue an outdated and misguided policy in an international forum.

Finally, Mr. President, I am particularly amused by the support of the Senator from North Carolina for more money for TV Marti. This program has been documented time and time again as ineffective. Certainly in times of serious fiscal constraint TV Marti should be eliminated; it should not be enlarged. It is very ironic that during the debate on the balanced budget amendment, when we are all claiming we are going to identify more specific cuts and cut out the fat in Government, here is a proposal which exemplifies the waste that has helped jack up the Federal deficit in the first place.

Mr. President, the chairman's proposal is provocative but it is unrealistic and shortsighted. I hope the administration will work with partners in the hemisphere to develop a multilateral strategy to promote democracy and human rights in Cuba and prepare for that day to which we all look forward, the transition of power in Cuba.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBB addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak as if in morning business for not to exceed 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBB. I thank the Chair.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INVASION AT IWO JIMA

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, today marks an important anniversary for all of us who served in the Marine Corps and for freedom-loving Americans everywhere. On this date 50 years ago, the largest force of U.S. marines ever assembled prepared to embark on the most savage and most costly battle in the history of the Marine Corps. Nearly 100,000 troops, American and Japanese, were ready to fight to the death on the most heavily fortified island in the world, 8 square miles of volcanic ash and rock known as Iwo Jima.

Since the turn of the century, marines had pioneered and developed the capability for seizing advanced naval bases. The payoff for those many years of planning and training was seen in the successive, hard-fought victories in the amphibious landings throughout the Pacific in places like Guadalcanal, Bougainville, Tarawa, and New Britain, and on Saipan, Guam, Tinian, and Peleliu.

But now in February 1945 marine forces were approaching within 1,000 miles of the Japanese homeland for the first time and would face a determined, fanatically brave enemy who had constructed the most elaborate and ingenious system of underground fortifications ever devised. Despite thorough allied planning and preparation and all the naval and air support available, it was ultimately the marine on the beach with the rifle who eventually won this critical battle for America.

Mr. President, one out of every three marines who set foot on Iwo Jima was killed or wounded, so great was the price of victory. As Gen. Holland M. Smith, Commanding General, Expeditionary Troops, Iwo Jima, said later of his marines, "They took Iwo Jima the hard way, the marine way, the way we had trained them to take it when everything else failed. They took Iwo Jima with sweat, guts, and determination."

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

AUTHORIZING BIENNIAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 73, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 73) authorizing biennial expenditures by committees of the Senate.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, is there a time agreement on this resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One hour evenly divided.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, on January 25, the Senate Rules Committee reported a biennial omnibus committee funding resolution. It is Senate Resolution 73 and it is reports No. 104-6.

The Senate has authorized the committee funding on a biennial basis since 1989, primarily due to the good work of my great friend from Kentucky, who is the former chairman of the committee. We have worked together many years now. Senator FORD has insisted on a biennial funding resolution.

The resolution before us today is a biennial funding resolution, and it is consistent with the direction of the conference of the majority to cut committee budgets by 15 percent. Senate Resolution 73 cuts 15 percent from the 1994 total recurring budget authority. It will add 2 percent for a cost-of-living adjustment for the 1995 recurring salaries and authorize a 2.4 percent COLA for 1996 for recurring salaries. There is also a 2.4-percent COLA for January and February 1997. The 1996 and 1997 COLA will be subject to the approval of the President pro tempore of the Senate.

This resolution authorizes \$49,394,804 for the period from March 1, 1995, and September 30, 1996, and \$50,521,131 between March 1, 1996, and February 28, 1997.

Mr. President, this is a reduction of \$7,641,011 from the 1994 funding level.

I have a chart here that shows the change in committee budget authority since 1980, and the Senate will note there has been a considerable shift in budget authority. The real dollar amount is in blue and the dollar amount adjusted for inflation is in orange. You can see that we have maintained a steady decline in the adjusted-for-inflation level of expenditures by the Senate.

We also have a second chart which shows the level of authorized committee staff since 1980. Since last year, the level of committee staff is reduced by 20 percent. In 1994, there were 1,185 authorized committee staff positions, and in 1995 there will be 947.

Again, I wish to point out that we are continuing the good work of my friend, the former chairman, the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. FORD, because these cuts are in addition to the 10-percent decrease that committee budgets took in the last Congress pursuant to his leadership.

Between 1980 and 1994, the Senate committees will have taken a 16.7 percent reduction in staff. I might say the House of Representatives took about a 5 percent reduction during that same time and that fact explains the difference in the amount of reductions currently being taken in the House compared to what we are taking in the Senate this year. But, I believe this additional cut in committee funding is a

good faith showing to the American people that we are serious about our partnership with them to reduce the size of Government.

Our people sent us a message in the last election that they want less Government. This resolution is another step toward a reduction in size of Government. This is not a new step, it is an ongoing process. It was something we have been working toward. But it is an example of the Senate's commitment to provide a more effective and efficient Government.

On a deflated basis, the total authorized dollar value in 1996 for Senate committees will be less than in 1980.

Last year all of the Senate committees combined only accounted for 17 percent of the total Senate budget.

Senate Resolution 73 continues the practice of allowing committees to carry over funds from the first year to the second year during the same Congress. This policy provides the committees with added flexibility to meet their anticipated needs and eliminates the incentive to spend or lose their money.

This resolution does not permit committees to carry over unexpended funds from the 103d Congress to the 104th Congress.

Any unexpended balances of the committees after obligations incurred during the funding period ending on February 28, 1995, will be transferred to a special reserve fund which shall be used to provide nonrecurring funds to committees that demonstrate a need for funds to meet an unusual workload or unanticipated issue that comes before them. I urge committees not to race to spend the moneys that are available for them to spend before February 28. That would diminish the special reserve and the reserve fund is of great importance to the Senate.

Last Congress the special reserve fund allowed the Senate to meet additional unforeseen needs of committees without requiring the Senate to spend new funds.

For example, after committee budgets were completed, the Armed Services Committee was required by law to conduct a major series of hearings on the issue of homosexuals in the Armed Forces. Those hearings required the Armed Services Committee to hire additional professional and support staff due to the substantial amount of work involved in the preparation and conduct of those hearings.

The guidelines of the Conference of the Majority provided for a total funding target that is 15 percent below the 1994 level plus COLA with directions that the Rules Committee consider a variety of factors and apply the cuts fairly. I believe this proposal is fair and balanced.

This resolution which was worked out by Senator FORD and myself and adopted by the committee takes into consideration the size of the committees, their workload, the growth that has accompanied the committee during

the 1980's, as well as other responsibilities of the committee.

Some committee reductions are more than 15 percent. Labor's is 25 percent. Governmental Affairs, Judiciary and Intelligence are each downsized by 16.5 percent.

The smaller committees—Veterans' Affairs, Small Business, and Aging were cut 10 percent.

There is a big difference between the impact of a 5-percent cut on a \$1 budget compared to 2 percent on a \$4 million budget.

What I am really saying is the administrative costs of a committee are almost the same. A committee that has a smaller amount of total funds is going to be excessively impacted in their ability to get their substantive work done if we do not recognize the difference between the large and small committees and the impact of across-the-board cuts. We have attempted to recognize, this problem in this resolution.

There are certain minimum administrative costs associated with running a committee. Every committee must have a receptionist, a clerk, a systems administrative person, as well as other positions specific to the duties of that committee.

With that in mind, it was the Rules Committee's determination that the smaller committees should not take a full 15-percent cut but should take only a 10-percent cut.

The impact of the 10-percent cut on those smaller committees is just as severe if not worse than the impact of the 15- and 16.5-percent cuts the larger committees received.

There is one exception to our policy. Senator McCain, the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, has informed me he intends to adhere to the 15-percent reduction that applies to all committees as originally submitted. That was his request to the Rules Committee. I am advised Senator McCain was going to make a statement to that effect but that he is not available to do so now. It is my understanding that he intends not to spend the full amount authorized. We commend him on that position. We merely wanted to recognize the impact on small committees by our decision.

A few committees presented cases for including nonrecurring money which was not authorized in their baseline. Only authorized recurring funds were included in the baseline.

Senate Resolution 73 also contains a sense of the Senate that space assigned to the committees of the Senate covered by this resolution shall be reduced commensurate with the reductions in authorized staff.

The Committee on Rules and Administration is expected to recover space for the purpose of equalizing Senators' offices to the extent possible, taking into consideration the population of the respective States according to the existing procedures and to consolidate the space for Senate committees, in

order to reduce the cost of moving Senate offices and to reduce the cost of support equipment, office furniture, and office accessories.

I believe this recommendation distributes the Senate's limited resources between the committees in a fair and equitable fashion.

I will soon move its adoption.

Before I yield to my good friend from Kentucky, let me ask for the yeas and nays on this resolution.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, as my good friend from Alaska, the chairman of the Rules Committee, has stated, before the Senate this afternoon is Senate Resolution 73. It is the 2-year budget authorization for Senate committees for the years 1995 and 1996. It continues the policy of biennial budgets established in the Rules Committee in 1989. We have 2-year budgets and we cannot get the Federal Government on 2-year budgets, which I think would save money. It would not balance the budget but it certainly would help us, give us some time for oversight.

But in the Rules Committee, and the committee chairmen have accepted it, where the money would lapse at the end of the first year, it would carry over into the second year of the biennium. The committees were not anxious then to spend the money, come back to us prove they needed it, and then prove they need more. So at the end of this year we had a considerable surplus as a result of the 2-year budget. That was returned. I think the proof is in the pudding and I am very pleased the 2-year budget authorization has worked so well.

The Rules Committee's job in mark-up was to find the minimum figure—and I underscore minimum figure—that will permit the committees to function effectively and efficiently. The committee conducted a review on a committee-by-committee basis. It was not all thrown in a pot and stirred up and figures pulled out. But my good friend from Alaska went committee by committee, colleague by colleague, and reviewed each committee's request with those chairmen and ranking members very closely.

Reaching a satisfactory compromise on the level of Senate committee funding is never easy. This year the problem was compounded, as my friend has said, by the overall goal of a 15 percent reduction coming on top of a 10 percent reduction last Congress. So, in essence, there was some shock as it related to the two cuts.

Senate Resolution 73 does not cover printing, but the report notes that the various Senate committees cut the cost of printing during the 103d Congress. In the last 10 years, expenses for

printing and binding were reduced almost 40 percent. That is a giant step. Expenses for detailed printers were reduced almost 35 percent. We saved, in those two reductions, \$5 million. The Rules Committee reduced committee funding 10 percent in 1993, another 15 percent under this resolution, and \$5 million was saved in printing costs.

These facts indicate to this member of the Rules Committee that it is doing an excellent job of controlling costs, and thereby saving taxpayers' dollars.

I believe the 15 percent reduction cuts most committees to the bare bone. To cut further would impede, in this Senator's opinion, them from fulfilling their responsibilities to the Senate.

S. Res. 73 does not include extra funds that would permit us to add moneys to committees unless funds were reduced from one or more committees.

Mr. President, I have worked with my friend from Alaska now for a good many years. I was chairman, he was ranking. Now it is reversed. I do not see much change in the committee. Our friendship is the same. Our way of working together is the same. The accommodations are the same. We have, I feel, done an excellent job of working with the members of the Rules Committee and then transferring that out to the membership of the various committees. Some did not like the cut, told us so, and asked for something less. But when all was said and done, the 15-percent criteria was adhered to, and I believe it is proper.

But I want to reiterate that, if we cut much more and we have already cut to the barebone, the committees are responsible for certain reports and certain bills to report to the Senate. They have an obligation to their colleagues to do a good job, and I think if we cut more than 15 percent we would have restricted our committees in their ability to do this job as it relate to this institution.

So I am very pleased where we are. I believe the Rules Committee has reached a fair balance in funding Senate committees for 1995 and 1996.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. And my chairman has asked for the yeas and nays. It is my understanding, so there will not be any misunderstanding, that under the unanimous-consent agreement yesterday there will be no votes before 5 o'clock on Monday. And, therefore, the vote on this particular resolution will be at some time after 5 o'clock on Monday next.

I thank the Chair. I thank my good friend from Alaska.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank my good friend for his comments.

I want to emphasize what he said. It is not pleasant to turn to the colleagues and say that they must cut their staff or expenditures of their committees must be reduced. But that was our task. I think we have done it as fairly as we can. I think the fact that, to my knowledge, no amendments

will be offered to this resolution indicates that we have either achieved our goal or intimidated our colleagues. But let history determine which is correct. We were fair. The Senator from Kentucky says we were fair. I think we have been fair. I do believe that it is an indication of what is coming in this Congress; that is, that we are going to be as frugal as possible in carrying out our duties in spending the taxpayers' money.

I do not have any other requests on this side. I might ask my friend if he has any request for time on that side.

CONGRATULATING THE RULES COMMITTEE FOR REDUCING THE SIZE OF SENATE COMMITTEES

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, today we are considering the resolution that authorizes the funding levels for Senate committees for the next 2 years. I would like to offer hearty congratulations to the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Rules and Administration for making substantial progress in reducing the growth of Senate committees.

The resolution before us authorizes \$7.6 million less for this year than the 1994 authorization, and that is a step in the right direction. Most of the committee budgets were reduced by 15 percent plus a 2-percent COLA for salaries. Of particular significance are the cuts in the budgets for the three largest committees: The Committees on Governmental Affairs, the Judiciary, and Labor and Human Resources. The Rules Committee should be commended for reducing the budgets of Governmental Affairs and Judiciary by 1.5 percent above the 15-percent cut received by other committees. The chairwoman of the Labor Committee also deserves enormous praise for submitting a budget that cuts expenses by a whopping 25 percent.

During the 102d and 103d Congresses I offered amendments to reduce overstaffing on these three committees.

In 1991, I proposed capping the number of available committee staff positions at 1990 levels. The amendment I proposed in the 103d Congress would have used the Finance Committee, with its substantial workload, as a benchmark. Each committee's funding level for 1993 would have been the lesser of either 95 percent of the 1992 funding level, or 95 percent of the Finance Committee's funding level—except for the Appropriations Committee, which would be funded at 95 percent of its 1992 level.

Since the beginning of the committee system as we know it today, we have seen a rapid growth in the size of committee staffs. Some of that growth is understandable, but some is not. In 1950, there were 300 committee staff positions. By 1970, that number had more than doubled to 635. It had nearly doubled again to 1,212 by 1990. In 1992, there were 1,257 committee staff positions.

In 1993 some progress was made and the number of committee staff positions for which funding was made

available went down to 1,196. Nevertheless, the number of staff positions for the three big committees remained at well over 100 for each—Governmental Affairs at 120, Judiciary at 128, and Labor at 127. This year, there are 947 authorized staff positions, and only one committee has more than 100 authorized positions.

I am very pleased to support this resolution.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Alaska that I have no requests for statements or amendments. I believe the unanimous-consent agreement last evening prevented amendments. Therefore, I have no one seeking the floor to make a statement today. I am ready and prepared to yield the time that has been allotted to me.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield the time allotted to me.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I yield the time allotted to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, As I understand it, we are off this resolution, and all time has been yielded on this resolution, and that there will be no further action necessary with regard to Senate Resolution 73. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is correct.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. STEVENS. Would the Chair report the pending business at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is House Joint Resolution 1. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes this afternoon, until other speakers come to speak on the matter before this body, to kind of review what has taken place over the last few days in regard to the balanced budget amendment, and, specifically, the amendment that is now pending before this body, namely the Reid amendment to exempt Social Security.

There have been, I think, a number of interesting statements made. The one that has stuck in my mind since it was made is the one made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] where he talked about a trip that he took to Central America, and a helicopter in which he was flying ran out of fuel and he landed. While on the ground waiting to be rescued, he spoke to a number of Nicaraguans or Hondurans—I do not remember which—who were native to the area. One of the questions that he asked to a young